

Applicant submits this paper in response to the official action of 4 November 2008 in which the Examiner rejected claims 1 through 3, 5 through 7 and 9 through 22, which were all the claims pending in the application. The claims were rejected as being allegedly obvious on the basis of Mulcahy in view of Horiuchi.

In support of the rejection the Examiner asserted that the patent to Mulcahy teaches structures substantially as claimed including main body panels, the middle panel, end panels, end flaps and alike with the only difference being that both end panels do not include end flaps. Examiner further contended that however, the patent to Horiuchi teaches the use of providing end flaps to both end panels. Based on this the examiner rejected the claims as being obvious and well within the level of ordinary skill in the art, contending that it would have been obvious to modify the structure of Mulcahy to include end flaps at both end panels, as told by Horiuchi, since such structures are allegedly conventional alternatives and structures used for the same intended purpose, thereby leading to structure as claimed.

Applicant traverses the rejection of the claims as being obvious made on the basis of Mulcahy and Horiuchi and requests reconsideration of the application both in the form the application was filed and in the form the claims have been amended herein. Applicant respectfully submits that when the claims in their currently amended form are reconsidered by the Examiner in light of applicant's remarks in support of patentability, where those remarks follow the claims, the Examiner should withdraw the extant rejection of the claims and issue a notice of allowability for this application.